



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,232	11/20/2003	Mark J. Rosenfeld	17207.2.1	9920
22913 7590 09/05/2008 WORKMAN NYDEGGER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				
EXAMINER				
HUGHES, ALICIA R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/05/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,232

Applicant(s)

ROSENFELD ET AL.

Examiner

ALICIA R. HUGHES

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 93-103 and 107-113 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 93-103 and 107-113 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3 sheets.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application.
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims and Examination

Claims 93-103 and 107-113 are pending and the subject of this Office Action. Applicants cancelled claims 3-92 and 104-106 in the response filed on 13 March 2007. Applicants cancelled claims 1-2 in their response filed on 15 November 2006, and added new claims 109-113 on 28 May 2008.

Applicants' arguments, filed on 28 May 2008, have been fully considered and are deemed to be persuasive regarding the previous rejections. Rejections and objections not reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn.

Upon reconsideration of the pending claims, as presented, the following new rejections are applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections being applied to the instant application presently.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §102(e), which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 93-103 and 107-113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pre-Grant Publication No. 2004/0038909 [hereinafter referred to as "Chawan"].

The teachings of Chawan and associated arguments disclosed in the Office Actions filed on 03 January 2007 and 12 May 2008 are incorporated herein by reference and extended to new claims 109-113.

Applicants have added the limitation "and leafy and/or immature plant part" in claims 94-99 and 107 and included the same limitation directly into claims 110 and 111 and by dependency in claims 112 and 113. Applicants argue that Chawan et al neither teach nor suggest the claimed composition in an amount so as to promote weight loss in a mammal, but instead teaches treating obese or overweight persons. If a subject is being treated for obesity, however, it would logically flow that promoting weight loss would be effective in treatment of the same.

And further as noted previously, Applicant discloses certain rather specific limitations in the claims that are believed to be inherent in the previously cited art. For example, Applicants claim, in limitation 99, a process where the dried harvested plant is *Zea mays*, an immature corn plant. As noted in this Office's previous action of 03 January 2007 and referencing Applicants' specification, the compound, 6-methoxy-2, 3-benzoxazolinone (6-MBOA), is known to be naturally-occurring in various concentrations in monocotyledonous plants, like corn. It logically flows therefrom that 6-MBOA would be found in the leafy part of the plant. As a result, 6-MBOA is inherently present in food compositions comprising corn, including the present invention. Applicants argue that there is no evidence that corn kernels, the part of corn ingested by humans to make meal, contain appreciable quantities of the composition recited in the claims of the instant composition appears to be but an allegation lacking factual support, which is inadequate to meet Applicants' burden of proof. Applicants do point a reference, Epstein, in its analysis. However, that article, for reasons stated by Applicants, most notably pointing to amounts of 6-MBOA found in wheat rather than corn, is insufficient.

As stated prior in *In re Best* (195 USPQ 430) and *In re Fitzgerald* (205 USPQ 594) discuss the support of rejections wherein the prior art discloses subject matter which there is reason to believe inherently includes functions that are newly cited or is identical to a product instantly claimed. In such a situation, the burden is shifted to the applicants to "prove that the subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess characteristics relied on" (205 USPQ 594, 2nd Column, 1st full paragraph). Applicants have not meet this burden.

In light of the foregoing, a process for promoting weight loss by the administration of an effective amount of a composition containing 6-MBOA, is clearly anticipated.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Hughes whose telephone number is 571-272-6026. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, can be reached at 571-272-0718. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Public PAIR only. For information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct-uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alicia R. Hughes/
Examiner, Art Unit 1614

/Raymond J Henley III/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1614